

THE GREAT SPEECH

13

OF

HON. JOHN A. LOGAN,

AT CAIRO, ILL., JUNE 30, 1866.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN : I am very much delighted to meet so many of you here this evening. It is not only a privilege that we have, but it is a pleasure to the American people, the citizens of our dear land, to assemble together for the purpose of investigating and discussing the questions that are presented to them for their consideration. Since the formation of this Government, it has been considered one of the great rights of the American citizen to not only examine and discuss the questions that were to be acted on by himself, but his right has extended to discussing and being heard by petition or otherwise by those who are in temporary power, and to whom it pertains to dispose of other questions for him.

THE SENTINEL ON THE WATCH TOWER.

Although we have for some years past travelled a rough and rugged road, and have passed through not only a bloody, but a fiery ordeal in this country, we have yet another ordeal through which we must pass, in my judgment, before peace and prosperity hovers calmly around and over this broad country, from one end to the other. We had hoped and thought that when this bloody and terrible tragedy had been enacted ; when the end of this great rebellion came, good feeling and harmony would be entirely restored, and that those who had fought so long against the Union and the perpetuation of this glorious Republic, with all their sympathizers, would have been forever hushed in silence. We had hoped that when blood ceased to flow, passion would have subsided, and those who had reserved and preserved our rights should have had peace, and that the land again should have prosperity and happiness ; that as the dark clouds of war rolled away, the genial rays of peace would have illumined our broad land with smiles of joy and gladness. We thought, at least, that the men

who arrayed themselves together for the purpose of destroying this Government, and for the purpose of building upon its ruins a government fashioned after their own manner ; after their final defeat ; after the Government itself had been preserved ; after the toiling millions had arrayed themselves together, holding the banner of this Republic aloft, and swearing eternal allegiance to the Constitution and laws of the land, that peace should have hovered over the land and covered us with its wings. [Great applause.] But if we only listen for a moment, we again hear the rumblings from afar. We are notified again by the mutterings and murmurings that we hear in the distance that all is not yet safe ; that the patriot's bounty in this land is not yet within his grasp ; that he may say, I am not only a patriot in the land, but one of the preservers of its institutions. [Applause.] We find that the sentinel has yet to be upon the watch-tower in order to give warning of approaching danger, there to stand guard until the people, the great commander-in-chief in this country, shall decide that the time has come for relieving him of his arduous duties.

WHEN SHALL THE SENTINEL BE RELIEVED ?

The question which comes to our minds at once is, When shall the time come that that sentinel shall be relieved ? When shall that moment arrive that there shall be no longer any necessity for the watchman or the sentinel on the tower, guarding with vigil eye the rights of the American citizen ? We, I presume, may differ in reference to that time. If I were asked when that time should arrive, I would answer thus wise : The time will not come in this land for relieving that man who watches over the interests of this great American people until the patriot of this land shall learn that he, and he alone, was the preserver of the institutions of this country and

of our national existence, and that he, and he alone, since he is its preserver, has a right to determine the time when that relief shall pass to this land. [Great applause.] And that he alone has the right to affix such conditions, for the interest of the whole people, as will forever preclude the possibility of treason and rebellion again drenching this land in blood. That time, in my opinion, will not come until the men who raised their arms against this Government and attempted its destruction, and even have the guilt of all the inhumanities and horrors of the late war upon their souls, shall learn, if they do not know it already, the fact that they are not the men, after attempting to destroy the Government, that have a right to step in now and take control of it, or any control in its re-organization. [Renewed applause.] That time will not come until they are taught that they, by their acts of treason, forfeited all their rights under the Constitution and laws of this country, and cannot demand as a right, anything, but are dependent upon the magnanimity of a great Government, to so rehabilitate or clothe them with such rights as are deemed wise and just under all the circumstances. Whether the people will so re-organize or reconstruct, through their representatives, those communities of people lately in rebellion, as to again allow them to take control of the Government, and re-enact the scenes in Congress of days gone by; or so provide that we will hereafter sail the ship of state through the calm sea of peace and prosperity, freighted with the proud anticipations of the present, and the fond hopes of the future, are questions the decision of which we anxiously await.

LET US GO BACK.

In order, my fellow-citizens, that we shall understand and properly appreciate these questions, as they are presented to the people, it would be well for us to go back to the commencement of this bloody warfare that has been enacted in the presence of the civilized world, and briefly examine it through its various stages, to the present time. It is necessary then, for us all to understand what has been done in this country. Has there been an offence committed against the Constitution of the United States? Has there been an offence committed against the Government of this people? If so, what is that offence?

In order to understand that, it is well for us to examine the Constitution of our country and see what offences may be committed against the Government. Let us examine what the offence of treason is; what the penalty for the crime of treason is; what the forfeitures attaching to treason are; and what rights a traitor has after he has committed treason.

WHAT IS TREASON?

My fellow-citizens, what is treason? "Treason against the United States shall consist in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort." Has war been levied against the Govern-

ment of the United States? If so, by whom? If war has been levied against the Government, then, under the Constitution, has treason been committed, and if committed, what are the results? what are the consequences? what are the forfeitures? what are the pains and penalties of such an offence?

My fellow-countrymen, it is not necessary for us to go into all the details of inhumanity of the struggle for the purpose of examining whether or not war or treason has been committed. You know well that treason was concocted by men in high official position in this country; men standing in high places, occupying high positions, for the ultimate overthrow and destruction of this Government. You know that after its concoction by these men, it burst forth upon this community and the people of this mighty nation, in horrible war, with all its atrocities, inhumanities, and desolating wastes, causing much precious blood to flow, and flow freely, and many noblemen to perish, and perish painfully. The shadow of the mournful result is, to-day, on every brow, and its deep furrow is in every breast. We find eleven States, with a majority of their people armed against the Government, committing all the crimes, all the horrors that can befall the American people, or befall any people. If you will only examine our own people here; if you will only cast your eye about and see the houses yet draped in mourning; if you will only turn eye and see the pretty urchins in the land without parents; the widows without husbands; if you will examine the questions for yourselves, you may easily decide if the crime of treason and rebellion has been committed in this land. You well know that there is hardly a family in this land, from one end to the other, but to-day is mourning the loss of some fond friend. It was not only at the hour of midnight, but also at the hour of mid-day, that the Angel of Death passed over the tents of our Israel. Not only was the first-born stricken down, but also the beloved offspring of our old age was among the slain. As the "sear and yellow" leaves were hurled abroad by the angry blasts of autumn, so were the noblest and best in our land scattered by the hurricane of battle. Some of them "sleep that dreamless sleep that lulls the dead" in one far off valley, and some in another; some fell on fields we won, and some, alas! on fields we lost, where they are destined to repose in nameless graves until the dread trump of the resurrection shall summon them to that awful bar, where crowns of fadeless glory are awarded by the eternal justice of Jehovah, to the re-illuminated brows of patriotism's immortal martyrs.

WAS THIS WAR?

Was this war? Is this what we, the American people, call war? If so, against whom was it waged? We all can easily answer. It was waged against the Government of the United States, within its own jurisdiction, by its own citizens. Was it then, under the Constitution, treason?

The Constitution says, treason is the levying of war against the United States, or ad-

hering to its enemies, giving them aid and comfort. This, then, was certainly treason on an extensive scale, involving every other crime and wrong known to the catalogue of crimes and wrongs.

WHAT IS THE PENALTY FOR TREASON?

Under the laws of this land it is death, and where there is no conviction and sentence of death it may be the forfeiture of estate under what is called the "Confiscation Act." Then if a majority of the people of eleven States in this Union were engaged in this war against the Government, they committed treason. If treason, the penalty was death [Applause.] If the penalty was death, the crime carries with it the forfeiture of rights, as the penalty of death does. Then, I ask you, my countrymen, to-day, the question, what condition did these people place themselves in at the time they committed or perpetrated this war against the Government of the United States? By committing treason they forfeited what? They forfeited their lives, and to-day they ought to be thankful to the magnanimity of this American people, that they are not in prison and on their trial for the crime of treason; and they ought to be thankful that they have not been hanged, that now they might be rotting by the side of Wirz, who suffered death for his cruelty to Union prisoners. [Immense applause]

WHAT RIGHTS DID THESE MEN FORFEIT?

Did they forfeit any? They not only forfeited their lives and their property, but all the rights they had, both civil and political, that they were entitled to prior to their act of treason. I demand to know of any man in this land, who is an honest man, who is a loyal man and true to his country, who claims to be a lawyer and to have an understanding of the laws and rules in this land, to tell me or not whether the man who commits treason does not forfeit his civil and political rights, as well as his life, if by the sentence of the courts it pleases his country to take his life from him. Will your judges and courts tell you, if a man steals five dollars, and by the laws of the State is sent to the Penitentiary, he by the laws forfeits his civil and political rights, can neither vote, hold office, sit on a jury or give evidence in court until these rights are restored to him by legislative action? and will they tell us that the crime of treason is less odious than such a larceny? Will they as lawyers and honest men tell me that the man who is a traitor to his country has rights without the legislative department of his Government having cast them upon him. [Applause.] We should examine these questions calmly, and if leniency is asked for traitors, we should at least demand justice for ourselves. [Renewed applause.]

My fellow countrymen, my theory is this: They forfeited all the rights they had both civil and political, and while they are in the act of treason against the Government, they can claim no rights under the Constitution and laws of the land. After the act of treason and armed rebellion has ceased, these rights certainly do not return to them until the

powers of the Government of the United States shall by legislative action rehabilitate or reclothe them with such rights as they may deem proper under the circumstances. They may return them all to them if they have a mind to, but none can the traitor have by his own right; he takes none unless the Legislature, which is the Congress of the country, shall restore him to his rights. [Applause.] If the rule were otherwise—if the rule or law was that a man could commit treason to-day and if he laid down his arms to-morrow he could be restored to the same rights he had before he committed treason, I would ask you, what offence would treason be in this country; what crime would it be? Certainly, by such a course it would be made respectable, and not made odious.

DID THE ELEVEN STATES COMMIT TREASON?

This being the case, I would ask any of my friends, if a majority of these eleven States committed treason against the Government, and I suppose there is no man so ignorant in the land that will say they did not commit treason, except some few, very few men, so learned in the law, that have so much learning that it has made fools of them. [Applause and laughter.] No honest man can say otherwise. If they have forfeited their rights, I want any man, I care not who, to tell me at what time these traitors to the Government have been restored to their rights. I want them to tell me if the mere fact of their having been captured as enemies of the Government, restores them to rights as citizens of the United States? It certainly does not. Then, in what way have they been restored? They have been restored by no act of this Government, and to-day, unless it had been by the assent of the Legislative Department of this Government, they would stand as traitors to the Government, trembling before the law—upon their knees, pleading for that clemency of this Government to be showered upon them, which they so often refused when offered to them by the lamented and lost President, Abraham Lincoln. [Tremendous applause.]

CONDITION OF THE REBEL STATES.

After this rebellion had ceased, in what condition did we find the people of these seceding States, as they are commonly called? Did we find the people in those States with a Government under the Constitution of the United States? Did we find them obeying the laws of the United States? They were without any Government of a local character under the Constitution and laws of the United States. By their act of rebellion they had destroyed or overthrown their State Governments, and attempted to re-establish new relations with a pretended Government at Richmond. When they were defeated, and captured, and taken prisoners, and Jeff. Davis, the head of their pretended Government, with all his cabinet, undertook to escape from this country, what condition were their people in? I would ask any of these men who seem to be the champions and advocates of treason in this land, these men who have never failed to

SIUC
SCRC
1869

sympathize with treason from the time that the first gun was fired at fort Sumter to the present time, to tell me what was the condition of those people then? [Applause.] Were they not traitors to the Government? They must certainly admit they were. Were they not guilty of treason? They certainly were. They were traitors before the law and in the eye of the Constitution; without State Governments, for they had destroyed them themselves, and by their own act of treason had forfeited their civil and political rights.

THEY HAD NO POWER TO RE-ORGANIZE.

The majority, having gone into the rebellion, no State Government claiming relations with the United States would be permitted by the majority to have an existence. The States were not out of the Union. They had only attempted to go out, and the question as to whether they were out or in the Union has been dependent upon the decision left to the arbitrament of the sword. This question having been decided against them, what power or authority had they to act? what would or what could be recognized as valid and binding on the Federal Government? How were they legally to re-organize their State Governments? If there were loyal men enough in any one of those States who had adhered to the United States during the rebellion, they, probably, under the powers reserved to the people, would have had a right to have organized a State Government and claimed a restoration of the relations heretofore existing between the State and national Governments. There was not enough of these people. There was a large majority of rebels, and they had no power to reorganize; the rebels had control, and with the exception, perhaps, of the land within our lines, all were rebels. It was only in presence of our army they dared to acknowledge the fact that they were loyal to the Government of the United States. There were not a sufficient number to reorganize the Government on a loyal basis, to claim the relations that formerly existed between them and the general Government. If there was not enough of these men to do so, how, legally, were their State Governments to be reorganized? In law there was no way to reorganize them except by Congress passing a law or a joint resolution restoring these people, or a portion of them, to their rights, civil and judicial, so that they could organize again their State Governments and reestablish themselves in the same relations with the United States Government which they had been in prior to the rebellion. This was the only way legally in which it could be done. But some of our opponents in the country say that these States were not out of the Union, and inasmuch as they were not out of the Union, the people themselves, under the reserved rights of the Constitution to the people, have a right to re-organize and establish again these relations. I would like to ask one question in reference to this. Where the Constitution speaks of "We, the people," who do you suppose the Constitution means? Does it mean the people of England or of the Uni-

United States? Does it mean the people who have their civil and political rights, or does it mean the people in different penitentiaries of the several States that have forfeited their rights by their crimes. [Applause.] It has reference to people who have no rights in this Government. When the Constitution says "we the people," it means "we the people" that have rights. Does it mean the wild Indians in the land? "certainly it does not, for they do not participate in the affairs of the Government. Then, if the opposition is correct in the theory that these people could organize themselves into State Governments and claim the relations that formerly existed under the words "we the people," then I will tell them the Indians all through the land might take a part in the affairs of our nation; these gentlemen in the penitentiaries of our States might claim the right to have a poll book in the penitentiary when the day of election comes on, because they are "we the people," or a part of the people. [Applause.] It means no such thing. It had reference to no such persons. These men being in that condition, having forfeited their rights, those rights must be restored to them before they can exercise them, the same as if a man was to-day convicted in this county and forfeited his rights.

CAN REBELS BE TRIED FOR TREASON?

These people say: why, you can't try the people of eleven States for treason; you can't convict them all, and unless you convict them you can't say that they have forfeited their rights. Well, I don't know. I am not the judge that has to decide that case. You may probably have a case of treason up some time, and some of these over-wise men may have the task of deciding that question. If they do, I want them to tell me this: What kind of evidence they want before a court before they convict these men, or present an indictment for treason. The Constitution requires: "No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court."

I suppose they might say that the religion of Jesus Christ is not in the land, because there has been no trial before a court, and no decision under the evidence there presented that it is here. I suppose they will say that Christ was not crucified, because they say no jury has rendered any such verdict that we know. I ask these gentlemen if you see seven hundred thousand men in arms, with a flag of a different character from ours, and hear at the same time the sound of their cannon thundering at the gates of our capital; and find these men with a Government claiming to be organized with a President, and Cabinet, and a Congress in opposition to ours, which should be theirs, if that is not sufficient evidence for them? If this is not enough evidence for these soft hearted gentlemen, in God's name what is? [Great applause.] If there is no evidence in this land that these men are guilty of treason, in God's name tell us what kind of evidence

we want to prove any fact in the world. But they say we must try each and every man, and convict every man of treason. I ask the question, where, under the Constitution, they are to be tried? By their own hundreds? Then, fellow-citizens, in many places that is a good joke. I suppose, on the same theory, you would indict Brigham Young and try him for bigamy by a jury of twelve men, each of whom had fourteen wives. [Laughter.] You would be very certain to convict him, to be sure. That is this theory, however, that these gentlemen want us to adopt. We are to try and convict them of treason by juries composed of the men who fought as traitors by their sides. I am, however, willing if any of these gentlemen want to go into this business, and try their policy, and hang each traitor they find, that they should do it. I am willing that these gentlemen throughout this country that are so technical and such great ticklers for the law, to go down and try them and hang them if they are willing to do it. I am perfectly willing for them to undertake the job. I think they ought to, for that would at least be doing something in crushing out the rebellion. [Much applause and laughter.]

But, my fellow-citizens, I am not one of those men who think that it is necessary to have a jury to investigate this question. Down in Mississippi I don't think any jury would live more than twenty-four hours that would undertake to do their duty, unless we had and kept an army down there. I am not one that believes treason is to be proved by two witnesses before I can be convinced that a man is a traitor. I can find plenty of evidence without that. I am one of the unfortunates that bear some of the evidences of treason in this land, upon my person, and there are plenty of others who have all the evidence that is necessary, or that any man on top of God Almighty's earth could want. I want these legal and learned gentlemen that go through the land, talking about the rights of the Southern people, to have done talking about the rights of traitors, for there are traitors, and a majority of them are traitors. The traitors have control of their State Governments, and through the war there were but few else than traitors down there that were white men, and everybody knows it that knows anything of the history of this rebellion. [Cries of "That's so," "Soldiers know it," &c., and applause.] Then, if this is the case, and these men have forfeited their rights, as I certainly claim they have, as I remarked before, how are they to reorganize the State Governments? There are but two ways. The one or the other must be adopted, or else some organization that is unlawful in its inception may be accepted by the legislative department of the Government, and by that means may be legalized for certain purposes and to a certain extent. But there is an opposition in this country to the Union or Republican party—these gentlemen want to term us the Abolition party—and, as I believe, some call it the traitorous party [derisive laughter]—I believe they have gone that far [renewed laughter]; I am perfectly willing they should go that far.

ARE TRAITORS ENTITLED TO REPRESENTATION?

These gentlemen, as well as the rebels, say they were entitled to representation in Congress the moment they laid down their arms, inasmuch as the States had never been out of the Union. This supposition is not correct. There is a great difference between a State in the Union, the people of which are true in their allegiance to the Government, maintaining and preserving all their rights as citizens, the right of representation being one of them, and a State in the Union, the people of which are in rebellion against the Government, and, by their treason and rebellion having forfeited all their rights, the right of representation being one of them. In the one case they exercise a right acquired under the Constitution, never impaired or forfeited. In the other case they forfeit the right, and can only again exercise it when it is restored to them by the National authority. The right of representation is one of your rights and one of mine, the same as the right to vote or to have any right political in this country. If you forfeit your right in one particular as a traitor you do in another. If these men in treason forfeited their rights as individuals, their civil rights, their lives, and their political rights, this was one of them. If forfeited, is it to be restored at the suggestion and will of the traitors who forfeited it, or at the will and pleasure of the men who preserved the Government? If this right was forfeited, there is but one way that it can be restored. It must be by legislative action by the legislative department of this Government, either by accepting a restoration that has been made full or complete, or where it has been made in part; or else they must act in a legislative capacity to restore and reclothe the people with that as with any other right. But, say these people, there is taxation without representation. If you tax these people you must represent them. If you are allowed to tax them you must let them be represented. I have not heard of them paying taxes during the past four years. Have you? If you take my opinion, we were not able to collect any taxes from them until we subdued this rebellion, and they have paid no taxes yet, and if they did, it is a duty they owed to the Government for the permission that they may live and not be hanged, as they ought to be. [Great applause.] Will gentlemen tell me the territories do not pay taxes? Yet the people of the territories have no votes in Congress. Do not the citizens of the District of Columbia pay taxes? They do not have a voice in Congress. How is it, then, that these people are so horrified at the idea that rebels might be taxed and not represented? But they cry you are doing great injustice to these American citizens who rebelled against the Government by taxing them without allowing them representation. I want to ask these people this question: If the right of representation is a right that cannot be forfeited, and belongs to traitors as much as to loyal men, I would ask "the Democrats," as they call themselves, or as I would call them, "the rebel advocates," why they were

not entitled to representation during all the rebellion? What would have prevented Jeff. Davis, during the rebellion, from having two Senators from each rebel State, with a member of Congress from each district, who had not participated in the war, and who would have taken the test oath for the sake of the success of a Southern Confederacy, and thereby, with the aid of their peace or "Copperhead" friends, controlled the Congress or the United States, prevented the furnishing of supplies, the raising of armies, the equipment of navies, and so effectually blocked the wheels of Government that the Union would have been destroyed and the independence of the South become a fixed fact? Is there a man in this country so big a fool, so great an ass, as to assert before this country that those men ought to have been represented in our Congress during the time of this war? I presume not. Yet if they had no right there, the right did not come back to them, as they threw down their arms, and there must be some act on the part of the Government to restore them before they could ever exercise it.

WE SHOULD NOT BE IN HOT HASTE.

It does seem to me that no lover of his country would contend for any other position; hence, when I find men advocating this rebel dogma, I am forced to the conclusion that their sympathies run more in the rebel direction than in the loyal channel. It does seem to me that in the midst of the burdens of taxation; after all the fears and sufferings—the tears, the mournings, the calamities, the woes, the agonies and despair that have been produced in our land by the action of traitors, we should not be "in hot haste" or too eager to snub loyalty and flatter treason, by an unexampled desire to hear the blusterings of disappointed and whipped chivalry in the halls of our National Legislature. The Representatives of the insurrectionary States left their seats when they held them loyally, by their own request and without our consent, and outside of its being legal and right to do so, it would be well to let them understand, when they return to take the same seat in the councils of the nation, they must come back at our request, and by and with our consent. It may be well they should learn they cannot re-occupy their vacant chairs by virtue of rights long ago forfeited by their own acts of infamy, treachery and treason.

IN WHOSE HANDS IS THE DECISION OF THE QUESTION TO BE PLACED?

If this be so far correct, my fellow-citizens, I want to ask you on this question of restoration, or reconstruction as some call it—it is the question of restoring the relations that formerly existed between the people of the State and the National Government, restoring them again as they were prior to their disruption or this rebellion—if these relations are to be restored again as I presume they will after a while at the proper time, I ask these treason advocates; I ask these rebel friends to tell me, and I am willing for them to answer the question, into whose hands is

the decision of this question to be placed? Who is to perform this duty of restoring the relations between these people of the States and the National Government? Is it the traitors of the land that are to have this authority? Is it the men just emerged from the rebellion, with their hands crimsoned with the blood of Union martyrs that you are to invite to the duty of restoring these relations? [No! No! &c.] Or is it the work of the patriot to do that thing? It is either the rebel or the patriot and Union man must do this. It is either the work of the men who were willing to and did save this Government, or else it is the work of the men who attempted to destroy the Government, and who did overthrow their State organizations. It is the work of one or of the other, because the line is drawn. There is a war political in reference to this question, and we are right, or the traitors are right. The traitors assert, and every rebel asserts, that they have a right to participate in the Government, and we assert, not so, not until we restore your rights; until then you have no voice in the affairs of the American people. [Great applause.] As citizens of this land, into whose hands are you going to turn this work over to? I, for one, believe this should be the work of the patriot and not the traitor. I, for one, say to the traitor,

"YOU WILL BE KIND ENOUGH TO TAKE A BACK SEAT."

These front chairs are reserved for the faithful; they are employed in performing a work in accordance with the designs on the trestleboard laid out by patriots; this you do not understand; you could be of no service whatever, but rather you would interfere with the workmen. As soon as the labor is performed you may enjoy its benefits as though you had engaged in its construction." [Applause.] This is my idea of who ought to do this work, and how it ought to be done. [Long continued applause]

Will these gentlemen tell me, and I would like to know to night, by what right, for what act or deed, are these men, who worked their great work of destruction in the land, to be permitted as soon as they have succumbed—as they have been whipped into submission—so soon as they have become loyal, as some of these gentlemen say, to enjoy these privileges? Why a Representative from this State, Judge Marshall, said these men were just as loyal as anybody because they were obeying the law. That may be correct, on the same principle as the horse thief in the Penitentiary is just as honest as anybody else, because he is obeying the law. The same argument applies to one as it does to the other. If they are loyal because they obey the law, they obey it on the same principle as the convict in the Penitentiary does—not from choice, but because they can't help it. [Applause.]

WHY SHOULD THESE MEN BE INVITED TO FRONT SEATS?

Then I ask, as I did a moment ago, what

have these men done; what act have they performed; what great deed or wonders have they worked that they should be invited to participate in this inestimable privilege of participating in the affairs of this great Republic returned to them? Is it for organizing a grand rebellion against the Government without any justification or excuse? Is it for insulting and firing on our national flag? Is it for continuing the bloody tragedy for four years? Is it for fastening upon us a debt of thousands of millions of dollars? Is it for thundering with deep-mouthed cannon at the very gates of our capital? Is it for causing their own land of flowers to become an almost desolate waste? Is it for filling our land with cripples, and widows and orphans? Is it for making every family in our land mourners at the grave of some fond relative? Is it for starving and committing the most horrible inhumanities on our poor soldiers while confined at Andersonville and other prisons? Is it for causing the slaughter of two hundred thousand as gallant and true soldiers and patriots as ever braved danger or faced death? Is it for concocting and procuring the assassination of one of the best men of the age, the late, and lamented President Lincoln? Is it for this? Is it for causing you to be taxed to pay hundreds of millions of dollars? If not for these things, in God's name tell me what these men have done for which they should enjoy the rights and privileges of loyal American citizens so soon as the end of their destruction comes. If it is not for these things, my fellow-countrymen, I cannot understand for what it is. I hope that some of these rebel advocates in our land, when they are frothing around the country and spewing up treason, will tell us why it is that these men are to enjoy these rights as soon as they have laid down their arms, or been captured against their consent. If not for these things that I have stated, what can it be for? Have they, during the four years past, raised the old starry emblem of this nation, and looked upon it for light and life? Have they mourned with us at the graves of our fallen heroes? Have they sympathized with you at the loss of your friends? Have they grieved over the apparent destruction of our Government? Have they cried out, "Our burdens are too great too bear, we ask to be relieved?" Have they come repentant, almost in sackcloth and ashes, and said, "We are the children of this Government; we have destroyed our rights and forfeited our privileges, but because we have done wrong, with knees bended and eyes turned to Heaven, we implore God Almighty and ask the people of this Government in their magnanimity, to give us back what we have forfeited by our error in following an improper path?" Have they done this? If so, I have failed to see it. If so, it has been at a time when I have certainly not been appraised of the fact. No, but so soon as treason—armed treason, I mean—is crushed, what do we find? Oh, what a humiliating spectacle it is! We see swarms of these traitors coming forward with

A PARDON IN ONE POCKET AND A CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION IN ANOTHER,

and some have even the impudence to step forward with their certificate, without a pardon, and demand what they are pleased to term their rights. As though there was any right under our laws and Constitution that any one of them could legally demand, save that of being convicted and hanged as a traitor. [Applause.] Yet, strange as it may seem, these men find many advocates pressing their cause throughout the country. The same party that advocated and sympathized with armed treason and rebellion during its existence, is to-day the voluntary friend and advocate of traitors, attempting to thrust them into the highest seats in the synagogue; and some, I am sorry to say, have joined them in this crusade against loyalty and in favor of treason; from whom we had reason, heretofore, to have expected better things. [Applause.]

WHAT PLAN WE WOULD SUGGEST.

Let us, after going so far with the question, let us see what plan we would suggest for the purpose of restoring the relations between these States and the General Government. This question of restoration, although it should not have done so, has taken somewhat of a political character. We find the rebels, and those who sympathize with them, as was the case during the war, on one side, and the loyal and true men on the other. It resolves itself into this: whether the people of this country will commit this question of null and complete restoration of the relations of the rebel States to the Union, into loyal or dis-loyal hands. Inasmuch, however, as we all must live together, and be governed by the same rules and laws, I am for the most liberal policy consistent with the peace, harmony and dignity of the country, that can be adopted. Believing, as I do, that the local Governments in the rebel States were destroyed or overthrown by the act of rebellion, and that Congress had a right to restore the citizens thereof as much rights as they deemed proper, and authorize a restoration of the State organization by the people thereof, or accept those already organized by the Executive, under and by virtue of the military authority, and as they have seen fit to accept the organization authorized by the Executive Department of the Government, in my judgment the most liberal course that could be asked by any one has been adopted. It seems to me but one thing more remains to be done to restore entirely the relations between the people of these States and the National Government, and that is, to demand and secure such guarantees for the future safety and peace of the country as will certainly put us on a safe and sure foundation for all time to come. These guarantees should be in the shape of amendments to the Constitution, as conditions precedent to the full restoration of the political relations between the people of the States lately in rebellion and the National Government. I find, to meet this view, the Congress of the United States, by a two-thirds vote of both houses, has presented a new article containing five sections, as an

amendment to the Federal Constitution, to be ratified by the States, which, after careful examination, seems to me to be so fair, so liberal and so much demanded by the exigency of the times: and with all my feelings leaning toward liberality on these questions, it is so much more liberal than I myself would have proposed, that I was perfectly astonished when I examined the vote and found every "Democrat" or "Copperhead" had voted against it. I could not understand it, and now can only account for it upon the theory that they did not want Alexander H. Stephens the Vice-President of the Southern Confederacy, and his brother traitors, to be prohibited from holding office, and that they did not want pensions paid to Union soldiers unless the same course was adopted with regard to rebel soldiers. If this was not their objection, I fail to understand it, as two of the leading features in the articles are the prohibition of such rebels as Stephens from holding office, and the payment of the public debt, including pensions and bounties to Union soldiers.

THEY SAY YOU MUST NOT AMEND THE CONSTITUTION.

We are told, by some people, by endorsing this you endorse something monstrous; you are tinkering with the old Constitution, with the charter of our liberty; doing something you ought not to do. Rebels themselves come up and say that. [Laughter.] I would like to know of any gentleman here what more unparalleled impudence there could be in the land, than for a traitor to lecture you or me about the Constitution of the United States. [Applause.] Men who have attempted for four years by bloody war to destroy the Constitution, come to you now and talk about the Constitution of the United States. [Laughter.] You will think that is a good joke! It is a beautiful idea. And we find men in this land, and plenty of them, who advocate the same doctrine. They say you must not amend the Constitution. Oh, no! Why must you not amend the Constitution? Why, you have the same right to amend the Constitution as you have to amend the statute law of the land, if it needs amending—the same right, precisely. It belongs to the people of this Government, and they have a right to alter or change it in any particular. If it be wrong, or if it fail in any particular, you have a right to amend it. The Constitution never contemplated a rebellion like this, hence there is a necessity now for the amendment of that instrument.

THE CONGRESSIONAL AMENDMENT.

I find, by examination, that this amendment the Congress of the United States has prepared, injures nobody, and hurts nobody. I see that, by looking at its clauses; at least no loyal man; but they except a few traitors, and don't allow them just the same privileges as they allow you and me. They don't give Jeff Davis and Alexander Stephens the same rights as they allow me or the same as they allow you. Rather, or the same as they allow the private soldier not want to claim a tax, and certainly not the

dier or the loyal citizen. I want to ask you as citizens of Cairo if you want to see Jeff Davis and the leading traitors placed on the same footing in reference to rights and privileges under the Constitution as the soldiers who fought your battles, and as you and I stand upon? If you do, your hearts are filled with a species of kindness that I have never been able to find lingering in the least particle in mine. [Great applause.] I was in this war, and I don't think I disgraced myself, although I did but my duty; but what I did I did on the side of my country, and I say it is the part of my country to make a proper distinction between the men who fought with me and those traitors we fought against. It is due to us to distinguish between loyalty and treason. [Applause.] I don't want that kind of equality. I will never be satisfied if the people of this land establish it. Of course it makes no difference if I am satisfied or not; but it can only satisfy a few that stayed at home and opposed us all the time, and who now say they conquered the rebellion. [Laughter.] They say we have destroyed treason in this country. I suppose if you wish just merely to satisfy and gratify the ambition and desires of a few of this class of politicians in this land, you would place Jeff Davis and all the rest of us on an equal footing; but I hope for the honor and credit of the American people, that no such disgrace will ever appear upon our statute books. [Great applause.]

Then, my fellow citizens, in reference to these propositions that are offered as amendments to the Constitution, it is well for us to examine them carefully. The first provides: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

There is something very strange in the argument that grows out of this in the mouth of the opposition. I will give you my view about it. All persons born in the United States, subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens thereof. I assert to-night that that is the law to-day in the United States, and in every other civilized government. That is the simplest proposition in the world. All free people must be citizens somewhere; they must have a government. Why? They must have a place that they owe allegiance to. They must have a government whose protection they can claim. That is a rule as universal as is law. Then this article to be put in the Constitution merely enacts as the fundamental law that which is declared to be the law already. I think it is right to put it in the Constitution, that there may never be any question mooted in our courts hereafter as to who is or is not a citizen; that we, as a great Government, a great people, a great nation, should certainly not want to claim a tax, and certainly not the

services of any people in this land, no matter whether male or female, white, black, or red, unless we allow them the rights of citizenship.

WHAT ARE THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENSHIP?

The rights of citizenship, what are they? The rights of a citizen are to sue and be sued, to own property, to have process of court, to have protection for life, liberty and property. But some of these men say it gives the "nigger" the right to vote. [Applause and laughter.] The man that asserts that this article gives the negro the right of suffrage, is a fool or a knave, one or the other, and he may take just which he has a mind to have. [Applause.] We find the law laid down in Kent's Commentaries, by Judge Marshall, Chief Justice of the United States. He lays down the doctrine in a decision in the United States Court, that all free men are citizens. Women and children are citizens. Why, your children are citizens; so are mine. Your wife is a citizen, but not entitled to vote. If she is not a citizen, what is she? Suppose she goes to England and somebody asks her "What is she? what country is she from?" shall she answer "Well, I live in the United States; but I am no citizen anywhere." [Laughter.] The English woman can say she is a citizen, but an American wife can't say she is a citizen of the United States. Hence, if she is captured upon any vessel of a foreign Government, sailing under a foreign flag, and she writes back to her husband and the husband goes to the Government of the United States, and says he wants the Government to demand her release, the Secretary of State is to reply, we can't do it, for she is not a citizen of the United States. [Laughter.] That would be a beautiful position for anybody to be placed in. Ever since we have had a Government, I tell you, all free persons born in the United States, negroes and all, have been recognized as citizens. Everybody has. Why, we have reclaimed men captured on the high seas, and we have demanded no insult should be offered to our citizen. Such a thing has never been heard of until Judge Taney made the decision that still reflects upon his name. You deny that women are citizens. What says the law? You can't prosecute an action in the United States Court at Springfield unless you are a citizen of another State. Suppose some lady in Missouri wanted to bring a suit in the State of Illinois. She brings suit against the defendant, and up comes one of your Cairo lawyers that knows so much about citizenship, and he puts in a plea before Judge Treat, and he says: "the defendant, by his attorney, comes and defends the wrong and injury, when, &c., and says and asserts that Mrs. Mulligan or Stephens is not a citizen of the United States, because she is a female woman." [Laughter and applause.] What do you think Judge Treat would say to your Cairo lawyer? He would say, young man, where did you study law? He would say, you are the first man I ever knew to say that a woman was not a citizen of the United States. He would say, weren't you raised down in Mississippi or South Car-

olina, or were you not raised where impudence took the premium and modesty was at a discount? [Applause.] That would seem to me to be the case. And yet a woman can't vote in this country. Why? Because the right of suffrage is a political right; it is not a civil right, and the rights pertaining to a citizen are the civil rights. The difference is so clearly marked I need not speak of it. But these men think they can humbug the people. They are trying to scare the old women and very young children. [Laughter.] The thing is so perfectly ridiculous, a man makes himself such an ass that insists on these propositions that he ought to be ashamed of himself to go before an intelligent community and assert such a proposition. [Applause.] What further is there? That all persons shall have the protection of the law. In the name of humanity I ask the question, is there a man, woman or child in this country, so hardened a wretch, that is not willing to give the protection of the law to any human being—that would not be willing that the shield of the law should be thrown around all; that would not be willing that the white or the black man should collect his debts in court; that either should own and hold property that he pays for. If there be such a man, he is going backward as his country progresses, instead of going forward with Christianity and civilization. [Applause.] There is all there is to that. I am for it most emphatically. I am for it for many reasons. It is not because I am the peculiar advocate of the negro or the white man, or anybody else, but

I AM THE ADVOCATE OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

I am the advocate of that which is right, proper and just. I don't care if it is to affect a white man or a black man, a woman or a child. If a man has not the nerve in this land to take that position, I tell him he is a coward, and he ought not to try and advocate anything, for if he does he will always watch the current, and advocate only the thing which is current. If the State of Illinois should pass a law and say that a negro, or a white man, it makes no difference, shall own real estate within the next thirty days, or else he should quit the State. If the negro has not got the money he would be in a bad way; but suppose we say that is all right. Suppose the next provision of the law is this: it makes it a penitentiary offence to sell a negro a piece of property. I should think that would be a pretty hard case. It seems to me this clause would prevent the States from passing any such laws. It prevents the States from imposing onerous burdens upon one class of people. Why was this proposed and why is it right to be in the Constitution? It ought to be in the Constitution so as to effect all the States alike. Down in Mississippi it was not six weeks until they passed a set of laws; first, that a negro should have real property, either leased or owned, or else he should leave the State. Then they passed a law that any man who sold him real estate, or leased real estate to him, should be fined \$1,000 and imprisoned six months. They then passed a

law that a negro should not go outside the district in which he resided without a pass; and then another, not allowing but one man to grant the pass, well knowing he dare not grant it. They also provided that if a negro was caught within the district ten days after the thirty days, he should be sold back into slavery. Such was the set of laws passed in Mississippi. That is the reason of the amendment to the Constitution that is here provided. It is to prevent a revengeful people from enacting or bringing about a state of things of that kind, that the Constitutional amendment is put in. And the man who goes round the country and talks about it being an under-handed way of giving the right of suffrage to those people is a demagogue, and so pitiful a one that he ought not be trusted, either on account of his dishonesty or on account of his ignorance. [Much applause.] It does seem to me that shame ought to mantle the cheeks of these men, but I suppose it will not, as the blush usually seeks modesty.

THE QUESTION OF SUFFRAGE.

Is it not a well known and settled fact, that under the Constitution of the United States, each State has a right to regulate the question of suffrage as it sees proper? Does not the second section of this article proposed, leave the question of suffrage with the States, as it ever has been left, by providing that those who are denied the right to vote by any States, shall not be enumerated in making up the basis of representation? Nothing could be more clear or more easily understood than this. The second section provides that "Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State."

I am for that proposition. Under our present Constitution, when it was adopted, slavery existed in the States. They provide in the Constitution that the basis of representation shall be upon the whole people, except "Indians not taxed," and "other persons," which applies to slaves, shall be counted three for five. Under that provision of the Constitution the States lately in rebellion would have a representation equal to three-fifths of the slave population. But this has been stricken out by the war, and slavery has been abolished. These States lose, then, this basis, yet under our last enumeration, on which the basis of representation was fixed,

they would still be entitled to the same ratio of representation. This being so, there is of necessity a change in the Constitution demanded in reference to the basis of representation. If this be so, what proposition could be more just and fair than the one proposed? Each State will be allowed representation according to its population, except in cases where it makes any law of disqualification as to its voters, applying to males over twenty-one years of age, except treason and other crimes.

This certainly leaves the people of the different States entirely free to make voters of whom they please. It only says to them, if you disqualify any male over twenty-one years of age, for any reason other than for crime, you shall not benefit by his enumeration in fixing your basis of representation.

This provision is certainly the greatest protection and the best security to the poor man and hardy pioneer that has ever been proposed to the constitution. It is a well known fact that as a country grows old and becomes wealthy, just in that proportion its people become aristocratic, and begin to draw a line between the wealthy and poorer classes; hence we find now, in some communities, persons urging as a principle that capital alone should use the ballot; that a man paying no taxes should have no voice in matters of legislation, as he has no pecuniary interest; others say that intelligence alone should use the ballot; that none should vote save those who can read and write. One of these propositions would entirely prohibit the poor man from any voice in the affairs of the nation, no matter what he may have suffered for his country, and the other would entirely disfranchise the unlearned but hardy pioneer, who has felled the forest and driven the wild beast to more Western homes, preparing the way that the fruits of his bold and enterprising spirit might be enjoyed by others. In the old State of Massachusetts none vote unless they can read and write. In the State of South Carolina, prior to the rebellion, none were permitted to vote unless they were owners of real estate. So it was once in Virginia, and so it might be again in many States, and inasmuch as the States have the right to fix the qualifications of voters, it does seem to me this provision or section ought to be considered as the unlearned and poor man's protection against any infraction upon the great privilege they have so long enjoyed and should ever enjoy. Every State is, or the people thereof are ambitious to have as large a representation in Congress and in the Electoral College as possible; hence, when this provision of the Constitution is before them, instead of leaning to aristocracy with concentrated power, inclined to the restriction of rights that would also restrict their representation and power, the tendency will be to a purer Democracy, with these cherished privileges more generally awarded to the whole people.

My fellow-citizens, lay aside your partizan prejudices and examine this fairly. Where is the objection to it? Is it not a necessity? Is it not right and just in every particular?

DISFRANCHISEMENT OF OFFICIAL TRAITORS.

The third provision, my fellow-citizens, provides:

SEC. 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State Legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid and comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may, by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability. [Applause.]

The Copperheads, or, as they call themselves, the Democrats—and I am willing they should have that name if they prefer it, because I really can't see the difference between the two names since this war began—are opposed to this provision in the Constitution. Why? I am in favor of it. Why? I am in favor of it because I am opposed to any man who, with an oath to support this Government upon his lips, has turned traitor to his Government and undertaken to destroy it. I am opposed to Jeff. Davis and Beauregard, and others such, after having been educated at the public schools of the Government of the United States: and I am opposed to any man who held office in this Government, and whose table was covered with delicacies dripping from the Treasury of the United States, and after fattening upon the best of the land, entering into the haunts of treason and assisting in the overthrow and destruction of the Government, as far as he possibly could. Now what objection have my friends—no, the Copperheads—to this? Do you want Jeff. Davis in the Senate again? Do you want Alexander Stephens to leave his seat as Vice President of the bogus Confederacy, to take a long stride in three leagued boots to your capital, coming almost with the gavel in his hands which he held in presiding over the deliberations of his fellow traitors? My God! what a spectacle that would be. In treason for four years, drenched in murder, infamy and crime of every character and description, with sword and bayonet in hand, with the very feeling against the Government and the people of the United States still reigning, that would assert supremacy in the heart of a fiend that would come from hell to destroy the people of the earth, that man could pass from the desecrated halls, from the poisonous and venomous spot upon which treason was concocted, with the very roll in his hand upon which treason should be written by his own hand. He should lay it down, get on the cars, and proceed to Washington, and next be delivering a speech in the Senate in favor of the rights of traitors. Would not this be glorious? All this would be glad tidings. See them coming to Congress and in the Senate. See them there as they come in, the doors open, and they march in with their heads up, and with yet the stench of treason on their garments! You see in their very

countenances the hate they have against the country; pale are their cheeks; rolling and red are their eyes; their breath hot as though hell itself was burning in their hearts; they march into Congress, and they strike hands with their glorious friends of the North, and take possession of the Government, and control it as they did at the very time when their treason was planned, with its results that followed, and we find that spectacle presented to the American people through the instrumentality of men of the North who claim to be loyal, under the name of Democracy. [Applause.] It is wrong to amend the Constitution of the country, they tell us. Don't you tinker with that sacred instrument. Don't you do it! Oh, no, don't! Why? you ask. The Copperheads say it gives the negroes a right to vote. That is their answer to the whole thing. That is all there is to it. That is their whole answer when you ask them aught. You ask them, are you in favor of Jeff. Davis having a seat in the Senate again? Well, no; oh, no! But do you think the people of Mississippi would select him, if allowed? They likely would. Well, you ask, how are you to keep him out? Well, I suppose, says Cop, he can't take the oath. But suppose he will take the oath, and know it is a lie when he takes it, what will you do then? The answer is, "I don't know what they would do, but I know I am opposed to negroes voting." [Great applause.] I am opposed to that, and if you recollect, don't you know John Logan used to be a Democrat and used to be opposed to niggers voting. I am just like him too, and I am agin this amendment." That is the reason they give. It amounts to that and nothing more. But I want to ask you what else this section that deprives the leading traitors does? It draws a line between the leading traitors and those men who were deceived. It discriminates between such men as Davis and Stephens, and Toombs and Slidell, and those which were misled and conscripted into the rebel ranks. If it does this, I ask you, who ought to be opposed to it?

I will ask a question of any man here, I care not what party he belongs to, Do you believe Jeff. Davis himself, with his cabinet and many leaders in this treason, ought to oppose this amendment to the Constitution? They ought to say it is right, and they would say it, if they would say honestly.

RIGHTS OF TRAITORS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION.

At the time that Davis and his co-workers in the cause of treason commenced the war against the Government, what position did they put themselves in in reference to the protection that the Constitution gives to its citizens, and the rights they enjoy under it? When they once drew the sword against the Government of the United States, they abandoned all claim to protection under the Constitution. Setting the power of the Government at defiance, they voluntarily relinquished all claim, or pretence of claim, to any of the rights or privileges of citizens of the United States, and said by their act, Here, we

openly commit the act of treason to the Government, and claim no protection or clemency any further therefrom. We forfeit all claim of citizenship, or any of the rights, immunities or privileges of citizens of the United States; with our own strong arms and trusty blades will we carve out our own destiny; we claim your protection no longer; our swords and our broad-mouthed cannon shall be our protection hereafter, until we are a free and independent people. To the United States they said: come on; we have taken your forts, arsenals and armories; we have fired on and insulted your flag; we have covered the high seas (with the aid of Great Britain and France) with pirates; we defy you; conquer us and we are traitors asking neither favor or clemency at your hands; we have sat in judgment on our own cause at the beginning, and weighed well all that we were doing. But, fail to conquer us, as you will, and we are a free and independent people, from under the ban of traitors, making our own treaties, and forming our own alliances. This was the position they took. We went to war. All of us know the result. They did not gain their independence; they did not carve out for themselves new and independent rights; they were defeated; their strong arms and trusty blades did not avail them. The United States Government put forth its strength to test the question as to whether the country should be saved, and the workers of treason should be punished as traitors, or whether the country should be lost and traitors from its ruins should build up an independent nation. The decision has been made and is final. No appeal lies. It is against the traitor and for the Government.

THE SUBLIMITY OF OUR COUNTRY IN THE GREAT TRIAL.

My countrymen, what sublimity there was in the action of our country in the trial of this question? Had the fertile soil of the North been sown by the fabulous hand of magic with dragons' teeth, it could not have swarmed any more suddenly with a crop of armed men. What the whistle of Roderick Dhu was able to accomplish in garrisoning an isolated Highland glen, the rattle of the drum, the unfurling of the old banner, and the watchword, "Rally round the flag, boys," was able to do here. A million of men were caused by these simple means to spring to the call, and they crushed out a rebellion that history furnishes no parallel to, either in the guilt of the purpose contemplated or the system of the plan inaugurated.

But I will tell you the true reason why the Democrats in this land oppose this proposition. It is because they accused us of being robbers and plunderers, and said the war was a war for selfish ends. They looked upon our soldiers as thieves. They looked upon this war as a failure for four years. After having done so, and feeling the same sympathy for these people as during the war, what do they now want? They want these same old Democratic leaders restored to power, so that they may again have Democratic leaders, or men who would soon be leaders of the Democracy; they want these same men's voices to be heard

in the Halls of Congress in defence of this rotten and putrid Democracy, that has become so since 1858. [Great applause.] It is for that reason, and for none other, except to carry out their purpose of regaining power, that they want to see these leading traitors placed upon an equality with citizens of the United States, so that the soldier in the land shall have no credit for what he has done, because by this very act you would strike from his brow the laurel wreath that is entwined there; you strike from the American citizen all that he claims he ought to be entitled to on account of his loyalty to the Government, by placing traitors on an equality with him, and in that way, instead of making treason odious, you make it respectable, and cast dishonor upon the acts of loyalty. [Applause.] I suppose this is what these gentlemen desire. If not, God knows what they want. I can't tell why they are opposed to this proposition else. It seems to me but right, and I don't believe eighteen months ago you could have got a man to have risen in the city of Cairo, and stood before the community and stated that if this rebellion were put down he would have an immediate equality between our soldiers and the treason workers. A loyal community would have kicked him out of their vicinity. But now they are in favor of being magnanimous—of restoring these people to their rights. They say it was only a civil war—it was not treason; it was a war—a little rebellion against the Government, and therefore it was not treason, because it was a rebellion. I remember to have heard an anecdote which illustrates their position. When the flood came and the ark was floating upon the surface of the water, a drowning man asked to be taken in. Noah refused the company; when the man said, "I don't care a cuss; it don't seem to be much of a shower no how." [Laughter and applause.] They say they ought to be restored to their rights again because it was not much of treason. I am opposed to that. I am in favor of these traitors being made odious in the land. I am in favor of putting it into the Constitution, too, that in future ages when after generations shall read that Constitution, they would see that their fathers, the loyal men of the land, put a mark upon treason and made a distinction between treason and loyalty. [Much applause.]

THE VALIDITY OF THE PUBLIC DEBT.

The next proposition is this:

SEC. 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of the insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations, and claims shall be held illegal and void.

It provides for the faithful payment of the public debt incurred by reason of the war, including pensions and bounties to our soldiers

It also provides against the assumption or payment by the General Government or any State, of the obligations incurred in aid of the rebellion, and also against the payment for emancipated slaves. This section, it seems to me, will forever settle many questions that would surely be brought before Congress by Southern representatives as soon as they were permitted to have seats therein. Certainly no one who has the interest of the country at heart, or has one spark of loyalty left, could desire to see the people of any State taxed to pay a debt contracted in aid of the rebellion, or the people of the country taxed to pay for the slaves that these people properly lost by their own treasonable acts. Nor should we desire to see at any time our Government repudiate the debt incurred in putting down the rebellion, or the payment of bounties or pensions refused to our soldiers who are entitled thereto. If this proposition be correct, then, under all the circumstances and surroundings, it is well and most proper to make it a part of our fundamental law that all future generations in looking into the Constitution may see that we held the debt of the Government, incurred in putting down the rebellion, as well as the payment of bounties and pensions to the soldiers who put it down, as something sacred; while we held the debts and liabilities in support of such an infamous cause as the rebellion, as odious, immoral, wrong, and not binding upon any portion of the people of this country. Should we fail to adopt this amendment to the Constitution and the South be admitted to representation in Congress, you will find that ere long angry discussions will be had and propositions made to repudiate the national debt unless the rebel debt is also assumed. They will claim they are not bound to pay taxes to liquidate the national debt unless their honor is probated by the assumption of theirs; also, that they are entitled to pay for every slave emancipated by the war, and that they will not be taxed to pay pensions to Union soldiers unless their wounded rebel soldiers are pensioned also, they being part of the citizens of the United States; that they are not responsible for what they did, being led into rebellion, and many of them conscripted. Then we will witness the spectacle of men, after attempting to destroy the Government, claiming pay for doing so, from the Government they tried to destroy. I fear they will then perhaps find in their Northern allies many warm advocates of these propositions. In order that these insulting and monstrous propositions may never be brought before Congress, much less adopted, let us now, once and forever, put a *quiescent* on them by adopting the proposition and making it a part of the Constitution.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE AMENDMENT.

The fifth and last section merely gives to Congress the right to enforce the articles when they shall be adopted.

My fellow citizens, I am clearly of the opinion that this article should be adopted by the States as a fair and just proposition. I want to see the issue made for or against it

in this part of the country. I want to see whether or not we have a majority who are in favor of a just representative basis; who are in favor of loyalty and against treason; who are in favor of making treason odious, by excluding the leading rebels from holding office; who are in favor of paying the national debt, and repudiating the rebel debt; who are in favor of paying to Union soldiers their pensions and bounties, and repudiating the payment for emancipated slaves. I am willing to risk the issue, and have full confidence in what the verdict of the people of Southern Illinois will be. [Applause.]

Thus you see, my fellow-citizens, that my opinions are in opposition to the right of representation being restored to rebels until the people of this country, not the rebels, but the loyal portion, shall consider the question and determine on what condition that right, once lost, might be restored. This right of restoration belongs to the people, acting through their representatives, and not to any one man. It is not a question as to whether a loyal man or a disloyal man shall be admitted into Congress at this time, but a question as to how you will restore the right to have representation from those States. This plan that we have been discussing having been adopted as the best that could be agreed upon, I most heartily approve of it. [Applause.]

This is no new thing to me, in order to keep in line with the party with which I have acted since the commencement of the war. If you will take the pains to read a speech I made in Carbondale on the first day of October, 1864, you will find that I took the same same ground; that the restoration of the relations of people in rebellion to the national Government must be so done as to forever deprive the leading rebels from holding office or participating in the affairs of the nation; that the political rights to be enjoyed by them after committing treason, was a question for us to determine, and not for them. In truth, until recently I never heard any other thing or proposition advanced or advocated by any man claiming to be a Union man.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL.

I find, since my return home, that there is some discussion of the subject of the Civil Rights Bill, passed by Congress over the *veto* of the Executive. When this bill was first published I read it, and hoped it would receive the sanction of the Executive. It did not, however, but became a law by the two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress. Why the opposition to this law, I cannot see. It has been mis-stated and perverted in every possible manner by the opposition. I have not time to give it in detail, but am at a loss to see wherein it is so objectionable. In declaring all persons citizens who are not subject to any foreign power, and giving them the right to sue and be sued, to hold property and make contracts, it no more than enacts into a statute that which has been decided time and again by our courts, and seldom controverted, as the law. The remaining sections of the law prescribe the mode and manner of ascertaining and protecting those

rights, both to the white and black man, prohibiting the infliction of more severe punishment on any one class of persons than another for like offences. This is certainly humane and just. It protects the soldier and the loyal white man from the oppression and tyranny that might be brought to bear against them in the local State Courts in the rebel States, as well as the colored men.

But it is said it was intended almost exclusively for the colored man. Suppose this to be true, where is the wrong? It is certainly an act of justice to him that the Government is in duty bound to perform, and the sole object being to break down a system of oppression in the States which would have succeeded, persisted in against the poor negro, it was right. It simply gives him the right, as I stated, to sue and be sued; to hold real estate; to have process of the courts; to have his cause tried in the United States Court, where prejudice will not operate against him; to be confronted by the witnesses; to have the same measure of punishment for his offences as any other person, and so carry out that provision of the Constitution that confers upon the citizens of each State the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the several States. It does not affect the question of suffrage in any way whatever, that question being left to the States by the Constitution. The man who in this country asserts that this law confers the right to vote and hold office, or any such privilege, is a fool or a knave.

This measure, or some one similar, was rendered imperatively necessary by the condition of things, and for Congress to have failed to perform this act of justice to the millions of colored people who were during the rebellion, with but very few exceptions, the only true friends and loyal persons to the Government to be found in all the rebel States, would have been to hand those people, just emancipated, penniless, without occupation or place, or bread, or any protection, over to the resentment, oppressions, tyranny, cruelties and scourgings of a disappointed, haughty, enraged and revengeful people. Such an act would have been a monstrosity—an act of injustice and inhumanity for which there would have been no excuse. But, my fellow-citizens, had Congress, instead of giving some protection to these people who have committed no crime, who were loyal and true to the old flag of our country during our severest troubles, passed a law asserting that rebellion is no crime, but merely a mistake which ought not to be punished, and thereby have relieved all these heaven-defying villains and their leaders, who, without excuse, caused the great sacrifices of this nation, from the odium and pains and penalties of treason, you would have heard every blatant Copperhead in the land rejoicing and crying out, "That is right; that shows that we are a generous and magnanimous people." Oh, how generous are they when traitors are in the question! How respected treason and all its horrors and horrible consequences in white men, and how odious loyalty, with all its many benefits and preserving qualities to the nation, in a colored

or black man, in the eyes of these rebel advocates and treason sympathizers! To my mind, my fellow citizens, loyalty is a jewel bright and shining as the purest gems of Goldconda, whether encased in the heart and mind of a white or black man.

FRENCH INTERVENTION IN MEXICO.

Another question here presents itself to my mind that is of great importance to the people of this country. That is the question of French intervention in Mexico. It is a well-known fact that in this country, ever since the administration of James Monroe, and the issuing of his message on the second of December, 1823, in which he declared that "henceforth the American continent was no to be subject to future colonization by any European power," that principle has been agreed to by all parties, and they have endorsed and professed to stand by it, calling it the Monroe Doctrine. The European powers have generally assented to the same proposition. But, in the midst of our troubles and just at a time when the Liberal or Republican party in Mexico had put down the inurrection there, and was establishing the best Government they had ever had, giving peace and prosperity to that land, the French Emperor seeing the troubles of the United States, took advantage of them, and seized upon it as a proper time for him to destroy Republicanism in Mexico, and establish Imperialism instead, creating thereby an empire for one of the spendthrifts of the House of Hapsburg, and a port for more ready trade with China, to compete with our carrying trade. This invasion was undertaken in violation of solemn treaty stipulations between England, Spain and France, of date October 31, 1861, and not only in violation of what we term the Monroe Doctrine, to which the French had long since assented, but in aid and as a part and parcel of the war of the rebel against the Government of the United States, and it has been marked throughout its entire progress by the most inhuman and disgraceful cruelties.

WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE WITH MAXIMILIAN.

In my opinion the war in this country should not have ceased until the head and tail of the rebellion were both dead. Maximilian should have been driven at once from Mexico. We owe it to ourselves to do it, and the American people were unanimous in favor of doing it. Never were people of all parties more united on any one proposition in this country, and I believe they are yet. Thus far the policy of our Secretary of State has prevailed. He is still "hopeful" that all will be right, and that Maximilian will leave some time; if he ever does. His diplomacy in reference to Mexican affairs is equal to the joke he perpetrated on the late rebellion, when he declared in one of his prophecies in 1861 that "it would last out ninety days." He promises the French we will be entirely neutral in Mexican affairs, and yet allows French neutrality to mean that they will prosecute a war against those people with over forty thousand French and Austrian troops in order to sustain Maximilian on his throne. He agrees with the French that if they take their troops out of Mexico in two years, it will be satisfactory to the American people, and yet does not require them to agree to cease their hostilities and barbarities upon the Mexican people during that time, but allows them to prosecute a wasting war against a people almost without means and munitions of war for two years longer, in which time they will subjugate them if possible and force an acknowledgement of the Imperial Government. And this is all done under the name of French neutrality. Arms and munitions of war are constantly supplied from this country to the ports of Mexico held by the French, and sold there to prosecute the war against the poor struggling Liberals of that country; but we cannot sell arms, munitions of war

or guarantee bonds to our own citizens, who would aid and assist them by furnishing them means to struggle on with. If we do it will be a violation of the neutrality of this country, and cause of war. "Some things look well and so do others," but really, I am not sure whether it looks well or not for the nephew of our Secretary of State, Mr. Clarence Seward, to leave that office and go and procure from Maximilian very liberal grants or charter privileges, and openly organize a company under these privileges in New York city, and also allow

GANGS OF LOBBYISTS IN THE INTEREST OF MAXIMILIAN

To be around Washington, traducing the Liberal cause in Mexico, and advocating the success of the Imperialists or of France, without a word of objection. Perhaps Mr. Seward can explain why it was that his nephew, who was so close to him in his official relations, came to the conclusion that it was better to procure the grants that he did from Maximilian than from the Republic of Mexico. I would like Mr. Seward to explain, and he may explain in person or through the Executive, for he explains through him sometimes, [laughter.] but in any way he selects, I want him to explain to me and to you, if he is in favor of republicanism in Mexico. But I may be making suggestions that are improper! There are so many things in the diplomacy of our State Department that it is incompatible with the interests of the Government to disclose! This may be one of them. If it be so, I hope I will be excused "on the ground of awkwardness," if none other.

Fellow citizens, I am utterly opposed to this "good Lord, good Devil," mean and cowardly policy on the part of our country. We owe it to republican institutions, to ourselves and to the struggling Republic of Mexico, by our side, who is trying to model after us, to act like men on this question, and at once to say to the French, "We have stood by this Monroe Doctrine for over forty years, and you assented to it; you must get out of Mexico; we want no more nonsense about it; you have got to go; stand not upon the order of your going, but go at once."

WE PERMIT ENGLAND AND FRANCE

To sympathize with and aid a great rebellion against our Government; to assist the pirates on the high seas in the destruction of our commerce; to insult us in every way. England is flanking us on one side with Canada, and we allow France to come and establish an Empire in Mexico, flanking us on the other, rendering it any easy matter in time of war to strike us in front, and at the same time invade us and attack on both sides. This may be the "hopeful" part of our diplomacy, but if any man will take the map of these countries, if he be a man that cares for the future safety and security of his own, with the unsatisfied portion of the country where they are, and decide that this is the policy of state-men, then I am greatly mistaken. This country has always permitted itself to be bullied by strong powers, and now let the American people speak out and say to our "prophetic" and "hopeful" Secretary of State, *this must be permitted no longer, sir.*

WE MUST CHOOSE BETWEEN LOYALTY AND DISLOYALTY.

My fellow-citizens, these questions are all presented to us for action. On the Mexican question, I feel very well assured, we all agree. There are no two opinions in this part of the country on that question. On the other questions the line will be drawn, and we must choose whether we will be the advocates of loyalty or disloyalty; whether the work of restoring this country on a safe basis is the work of loyal men or traitors; whether leading traitors lost anything by their treason, or are to be placed upon an equal footing with loyal men; whether our Constitution shall be so amended as to discriminate between those who tried to destroy the Government

and those who saved it. The question is not, whether loyal men or disloyal men shall be admitted to seats in Congress from disloyal States, but whether any representative is admissible until a restoration is provided for upon a fair and proper basis and sure foundation for the peace, prosperity and security of this country in the future; whether we are willing to relinquish all the fruits of our success in subduing the rebellion, or hold on to them; whether people against whom there is a prejudice, poor and penniless, shall be turned over to rebel barbarities, or protected by the United States Government. These are the principal questions involved. The course for the loyal man is plain.

This is the great political battle that shall settle the peace and happiness of this people. The loyal and true men of the country saved it when assailed and are proposing the reorganization of the insurgent portions on an honest and just basis, and in the name of the country and of all our hopes in the future, let us assist them in doing it. It was the loyal and not the disloyal who, by their strong arms and will caused the old flag to again exultingly and gracefully wave over every inch of our soil. Not an acre of our territory have we lost, but saved it, and the keen crack of the lash, and the clanking of the chain of slavery are to be heard no more forever. Let no step backward be taken. Let the restoration of free people to their practical relations to the Government when finally consummated be so done that we shall be one and indivisible, destined to so remain forever, flourishing in an immortal youth, unburt amid the roar of the elements, with our future, long years of glory and grandeur, prospects and happiness looming up, and with our advancing steps causing us to become more and more formidable in power, exhaustless in resources, ripe in intelligence, and wise in statesmanship.

THE FUTURE.

Paint in your imagination the most beautiful picture of the future of this youthful country that you can. See it spanned from lakes to gulf and from ocean to ocean with the iron rails of innumerable roads of traffic; its coasts lined with vessels bearing the products of our fruitful soil to all the nations of earth; its mineral and agricultural resources developed to such an extent as to cause all to look on in wonder and amazement; its cities, towns and villages dotting the land from one end to the other; its schools, churches and institutions of learning models for the Old World; its advancement in the arts, sciences and civilization and in civil and religious liberty out-ripping all others; its republican and liberal institutions becoming popularized throughout the world; its state-men without rivals; its armies the dread of all war-like powers and its navies controlling the seas, and then you have not half pictured its destiny. Ask yourselves then, this question, "To whom are we indebted for this? Who was it saved the ship of state when the storm was at its wildest? Was it the traitors? No! Was it Lee's Northern allies, the Democrats or "Copperheads"? No! Well who was it? I can see the answer sparkling in every eye. I fancy I can hear it trembling upon every lip. I feel it vibrating through my own physical frame. It comes up in the low whisperings of the soft south wind as it sighs over the lonely pillows of our martyred heroes. It is an answer that ought to be written on the last leaf of every Bible in the land, in order that the Christian might first learn of the salvation of his soul, and then of the salvation of his country. It was the union man at home, and the patriot-soldier in the field.

WHERE WILL THE SOLDIERS STAND?

I am sometimes asked where will the soldiers stand in this contest. He ought to stand, and I am very sure the great mass of them will stand by the action of the loyal men in Congress who are trying to restore the country on such a basis, as not to lose that which the soldiers poured out oceans of

9-83
 blood, and filled countless graves, to save. Ask not the true soldier for such leniency toward traitors, as will encourage them not only to exhibit their hatred for us and the soil where our comrades "sleep the sleep that knows no waking," but to defile their graves. No sir! We want to know that

"The hopes, the fears, the tears, the blood,
 That marked the bitter strife,
 Are all crowned by the fruits of victory,
 That saved the nation's life."

Until this is done, the soldier will feel as though his hard and weary marches, campaigns and battles were to little purpose.

WHERE WILL THE IRISHMEN STAND?

My countrymen, I want to ask where the Irishman, who has a love of liberty, and knows of the wrongs and sufferings of the people of his native land during seven centuries, will stand in this coming contest on these questions. If he ever expects Ireland to be free, he must have the sympathy, at least, of some strong party or power somewhere, and if he expects liberty for his people, he must be in favor of liberty for others. Does he expect by acting and voting with the Democratic or "Copperhead" party in this country to advance his cause? Is not that party the defender of and sympathizer with treason, tyranny and slavery? Do they expect that these men, who sympathized with a rebellion, the very cornerstone of which was slavery, will sympathize with or aid him in any way to obtain liberty for his beloved land? If the Irish desire sympathy, encouragement or aid in their cause, they must act with the party in this country who has the liberty and freedom of all engaged as one of its cardinal principles, in the very soul of its organization. If they continue to act with the party that they have heretofore, who are not propagandists in the cause of liberty, and who fail at all times to discriminate the doctrine of liberty to all mankind, they will find but little sympathy in their own cause and no aid from those with whom they act, and should expect but little from those they constantly war with politically. These are matters that I hope the Irish people may well consider. I am their friend, and in their struggle for the freedom of Ireland, the land of my father's birth, they have my best wishes for success, and the warmest and strongest sympathies of my heart.

FINALLY.

My fellow citizens, I have presented to you my views, without restraint. I have said all that I

wish to say, and have said a great deal more, perhaps, than I ought to have said. I have detained you, how long I can't tell; I know my watch has run down while I have been speaking. I have been talking a great while, I know; and yet was there anything more I could say in order to enforce upon you your duty to this land, I would say it. Inasmuch as I cannot, I appeal to you, in conclusion, in the coming contest, to stand by the men who have stood by the country; stand by the propositions and laws that favor and protect loyalty, and that render treason odious. Let the same account be rendered this fall that has been before in this part of the country, on the side of loyalty to the cause of the country. Take no backward step; stand by your guns; be not driven an inch. Our position is a secure one; we are well entrenched behind justice, honor and patriotism. The enemy's guns are manned by rebels, with skirmishers of "Copperhead" militia. Meet them with the same resolution that the Illinois soldiers always met the enemy on the battlefield, and to the undying honor of them be it eternally recorded, they were always first in the charge and last in the retreat; their conduct was too grand to be reached by any apostrophe of poetry or eloquence, and in the sublimity of its own moral grandeur it must forever tower among the great events of the nineteenth century. Let us in like manner do our duty now as Illinoisans.

I can say no more. I have not the power to appeal to you as I desire; and the eloquence in the score that crimsoned the hard-fought battles of Belmont, Donelson, Shiloh, Vicksburg, Perryville, Murfreesboro, Chickamauga, Mission Ridge, Ringold, Kenesaw Mountain, Atlanta, Gettysburg and the Wilderness, must now appeal to you for the prompt performance of one of the sacred duties that circumstances make imperative upon the patriot. These fields of bloody slaughter appeal to you with their red mouths in the name of Heaven, in the name of the patriots beneath their bloody soil, in the name of the country we live in, in the name of the flag of this great land. We implore you men, now, that have a right to act in this contest, to act in such a manner as becomes pure patriots and lovers of your country, and let that act be such that will mark treason and make it odious, and will make loyalty respectable. When you are ready, then give to these men, the workers of treason, such rights that they require or ask for, at the time it shall suit yourselves, in accordance with the proposition of amendment of the Constitution, and not in accordance with any claim they make to you for rights they have forfeited long ago by their treachery, infamy and treason.